

the bill, that writing of it was necessary, in my view, to make it possible to continue having a consent calendar, which meant a lot of bills which were not priority would be taken ahead of priority bills. My objection was that I see nothing in any rule which says one priority bill will be jumped above another priority bill. When we got word from the Speaker about selecting our priority bills, not only were we given the deadline but we were given the very clear impression that these bills will be dealt with on the basis of when they are reported as having been selected. And to ensure that that was done, not only would the date be recorded but the actual time or hour by the clock when it was received. So I think when we have a specific plan of priority bills it should not give place to bills which, in this case, the introducers didn't ask that they be jumped out of order, and with the crime bill nobody even was going to prioritize it, although it had been out here for some time. And had Senator Withem not prioritized it, it would not have gotten a priority designation at all. So, of all the senators who had the opportunity to prioritize that bill, including the introducer, nobody was going to do it. I'm not going to argue all the other ins and outs but that was the rationale, in brief, behind my position and I want to give Senator Withem credit, and Senator Bromm, for being willing to resolve this part of it in as amicable way as we did, at least I think it was.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Withem, anything further? We turn then...we return then to a discussion of LB 106. We are on the Beutler amendment. Senator Vrtiska, your light is on, do you wish to speak to the Beutler amendment? Senator Warner, do you wish to speak to the Beutler amendment?

SENATOR WARNER: Madam President and members of the Legislature, I would rise to oppose the Beutler amendment. If I'm understanding it correctly, I didn't go up and look at the desk, but I believe it struck lines 10 and 11, on page 2. And I assume that maybe for purposes of discussions generally, as Senator Beutler commenced, but this morning when we were talking about it I, since there was not a committee amendment, I hadn't looked at the bill to refresh my mind as well as I should have before we started. But there are a number of things, changes in the bill that you looked at, that are consistent with what is the new language on the front page but it was stricken language later on for the example; agricultural chemicals for planting crops have been exempt for a number of years from the beginning,